

DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS"

Entered at the Postoffice at Lakebay, Wash., as Second Class Matter.

VOL. II. NO. 14.

LAKEBAY, WASH., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 65.

THE FOOL'S PRAYER.

The royal feast was done: the king
Sought some new sport to banish care,
And to his jester cried, "Sir Fool,
Kneel now, and make for us a prayer."

The jester doffed his cap and bells
And stood the mocking court before;
They could not see the bitter smile
Behind the painted grin he wore.

He bowed his head and bent his knee
Upon the monarchs' silken stool;
His pleading voice arose, "O Lord,
Be merciful to me, a fool!"

"No pity, Lord, can change the heart
From red with wrong to white as wool
The rod must heal the sin; but Lord,
Be merciful to me, a fool!"

"'Tis not by guilt the onward sweep
Of truth and right, O Lord, we stay;
'Tis by our follies that so long
We hold the earth from heaven away.

"The clumsy feet, still in the mire,
Go crushing blossoms without end;
These hard, well-meaning hands we thrust
Among the heart strings of a friend.

"The ill-timed truth we might have kept—
Who knows how sharp it pierced and stung?
The word we had not sense to say—
Who knows how grandly it had rung?"

"Our faults no tenderness should ask
The chastening stripes must cleanse
them all;

But for our blunders—oh, in shame
Before the eyes of heaven we fall.

"Earth bears no balsam for mistakes;
Men crown the knave and scourge the fool

That did his will; but thou, O Lord,
Be merciful to me, a fool!"

The room was hushed; in silence rose
The king, and sought his gardens cool,
And walked apart and murmured low,
"Be merciful to me, a fool!"

—Edward Rowland Sill.

BOYCOTTED.

CLEVELAND, O., August 3, 1899.

Dear Citizen Editor Penny Magazine:

The Gatling Gun will no longer be published. I have struck my last blow in behalf of free press. The fight is finished, so far as I am concerned. The countless persecutions to which I have been subjected here in Cleveland, day after day, have proven too much for me. I am broken physically and financially. My health is shattered and my resources destroyed. Both were always frail, and now both are gone entirely. Because of the row that was raised about my case I think the enemy feared to suppress me forcibly. In my opinion, they dreaded most that congressional investigation, you suggest, for which arrangements had been made. They crippled my credit, then utterly destroyed it. They put the screws on me in every direction. Printers and all other people are afraid to do my work, lest they be boycotted. I am unable to longer secure office quarters as everybody fears to take me in. Conditions are such that it is impossible for me to continue in business in Cleveland. I have had to make my fight here alone, without a single local friend (no one

dares to be known as my friend), and I have met with utter defeat. In this fact I find more than the bitterness of death. This is the reward that always comes to him who champions the cause of liberty and justice.

I haven't the heart to write you the details, even should they happen to interest you, which very likely they would not.

I thank you for the interest you have taken in the Gun, and in my case, and in the things for which the one has contended and which the other represents. Tyranny triumphs, as usual, and the chapter is closed.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER HURT.

The foregoing will doubtless serve as a warning to weak-kneed, jelly-backed would-be reformers not to lay iconoclastic hands upon time-honored (God and Devil save the mark) institutions, but not so to the men and women who realize that there can be no compromise between irreconcilable antagonisms—since there can be no half-way ground between slavery to preconceived opinions and freedom to think before tradition's musty shell. The suppression of "Gatling Gun" instead of retarding the onward march of progress will give it added impetus; instead of silencing men with opinions and a will it furnishes them an incentive to redouble their efforts to stir the stagnant pool of thought till the sleeping masses are awakened from their lethargy.

Joes Bay people are emphatic in their denunciation of a system (government) that enables toadies, flunkies and intellectual prostitutes to suppress a secular journal, ruin a man's business and assassinate his reputation for no other reason than that he was loyal to a principle as foreign to the concept of his persecutors as are the hieroglyphics on the mountains of the moon. While our sympathies are with him as an individual we decry his advocacy of statism, or government, because government is founded on force or man-made laws, hence, it is self evident that to sustain one law requires more laws (force), and so on and on, till we now have a conglomerate mass of laws so worded as to be susceptible of any interpretation to suit the convenience of judges afflicted with an itching palm.

Walter Q. Hurt's crime consists in being an honest man; his offense against the body politic was his aggressiveness upon the machinations of those in high places. Had he prostituted his time and talents in the service of either of the fossilized bunco games (Republican and Democratic parties), instead of being a candidate for the penitentiary he might have been on the high road to gubernatorial or senatorial honors with a servile press cringing at his command.

Moral: Be a man and invoke the ire of the howling mob; or be a ninny and lick the hand that smites you.

I. Y. G.

PRINCIPLE AND POLICY.

A soundly founded movement will grow marvelously, if the members act up to their principles. A principle is a troublesome thing, and no wonder that so many persons have distaste for it. A principle is a distinctive sign of opinion, chosen and accepted. It is a mark by which a man is known. It is a profession of conduct; it implies a method of procedure; it is a rule of action, a pledge of policy to be pursued. To be a man of principle is to be known as a person having definite ideas. Such a one is regarded as a man who sees his way, and has chosen it. While others are confused, he is clear. While others go round about, he goes straight on. When others are in doubt, he knows exactly what to do. But the majority are not of this quality. They see the principle for a short time, and then lose sight of it; and when they learn that it requires purpose and courage to act up to it they do not want to see it again. They do not understand that a true principle is the best way of attaining the end they have in view; and if success presents any difficulty they are quite ready to try another way. Indolence or impatience, timidity or cupidity, suggests to them an easier, a safer, a quicker, or more profitable way, and they are ready at once to set out on the new path. Some one may point out that the new path leads to a point the very opposite of that they proposed to reach. This does not disturb them. Having no clear discernment of the nature of principle, or passion of it, they think one object as good as another, or better, if they see immediate advantage in it. These persons are not at all interested when you explain to them that they have lost sight of principle. They give you to understand that all recurrence to principle is "dry"; and, if you propose to return to it, they describe you as a "theorist," well intended, but clearly "impracticable." There are others who readily adopt a principle, and profess a willingness to carry it out, but when they are required to stand to it, and stand by it against all comers, that is quite another thing. If you remind them that being pledged to one thing means that they are not to do the opposite thing, you find they have never thought of this.—George Jacob Holyoake.

HONOR AND TRUTH SACRIFICED.

The Catholic party abroad—so far as politics are concerned—seems to be one of the most immoral parties that exist. But there is a reason for it, as for all other things, big or little, in this world of ours. Give yourself up to authority, renounce personal conscience and personal self guidance, and you are doomed to become a mere counter in the great game that is being played around you. Be untrue to your own higher nature and no friendly hand will be strong enough to save you as the great forces whirl you on to the precipice. The

Daily News correspondent wrote (July 19) about the coalition of the Catholics with the Socialists in Bavaria: "The Bavarian elections have resulted in a manner which must have its effect upon the whole domestic policy of Germany. Of 159 seats the clerical centre have gained 82, thus commanding alone a majority. This in itself is important enough, but its significance is enhanced by the way in which the victory was achieved. The Clericals did not shrink from concluding a regular pact with the Social Democrats; the two parties by acting against the Liberals brought about the result mentioned. Never before had the clericals in Germany dared to go officially hand in hand at the elections with Social Democracy, which, from the highest quarters, rightly or wrongly, has been stigmatized as hostile to the empire." Can anything show more vividly the demoralizing influence of the struggle for power than the momentary alliances of those who in reality are in deadly conflict with each other?—Free Life, London.

The wealth of nature is unlimited. I say this advisedly. It is without limit. Latent, in inconceivable quantities, there always has and now exists a full supply of everything for every being that ever lived, is living now or ever will live. In the ground in latency are all the vegetables that billions might want. The supply is inexhaustible, because the universe is whole and complete and cannot be added to or taken from. We may raise a billion bushels of potatoes this year, but we have not lessened the supply existent in nature. Through various processes of change, in the course of the year, the potatoes have been returned to nature and she is ready to furnish them again. And this is true of every product and of all products in any quantity for all time to come. Man does not comprehend this great truth, and by his assertion that nature is limited in its law of supply he himself sets a limit to what he receives. And because of this he gives titles to the unstinted bounty of nature and gives his productions to those who do not do the necessary work of changing the forms of nutrition into foodstuffs in return for the privilege of making the change. There is enough for all—the only obstacle that stands in the way is ignorance. And until this ignorance is changed into intelligence men must suffer.—Pilgrim, in Appeal to Reason.

Science is mistress of the world. It reigns without ever needing to command. The church and the law have to inform themselves of its decrees, and reform themselves according to its teachings.—Michelet.

Law is the most narrowing, the most degrading of the professions. All human law is a system of fossilized injustice, and habitual study of it only demoralizes men.—H. F. Durant.

DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS".

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT LAKEBAY, WASH.

50 CENTS A YEAR

Address all communications to DISCONTENT,
Lakebay, Wash.

Make all money orders payable on TACOMA,
Wash.

DIDEROT'S ANARCHY.

I am convinced that there can be no real happiness for the human race except in a social state in which there is neither king nor magistrate, nor priest nor laws, nor mine nor thine, nor property in goods or lands, nor vices nor virtues.

ANARCHIST SOCIALISM.

Definitions of Anarchy multiply, as evidence that it is felt necessary to give the authority of explanation to a word denying it and suggesting the existence of society without form, which two classes of minds have very curiously come to think possible, and as society so far, having always had form, has made nobody perfectly happy, that perhaps Anarchy, or no form at all, might be more successful; indeed, they insist it would.

These two classes of minds are those ignorant, who fancy that all their ailments are created by the laws whose pressure they constantly feel as a painful restraint, and some highly cultivated idealists who, from their own intelligence and character being incapable of evil or hurtful conduct (having no disposition to it), believe that all other men, if left to themselves, and without any laws, would exhibit the same inoffensiveness, and that laws, consequently, are entirely unnecessary and should be gotten rid of, and absolute individual liberty substituted in their place, or, in a word, no authority.

Such is the true Anarchy—no authority; nor can it be given any definition but its own name, with all respect, or rather disrespect, to the Century definition—the union of order with the absence of government of man by man.

Now, it is quite possible, without being an Anarchist, to feel a sympathy for Anarchy as a phenomenon which must have a sentimental reason for existence. Men are unhappy—poor, sick, starved, killed in wars, enslaved, in connection with or under the governing of a thousand dogmas of right or wrong which are believed en masse and enforced in all the societies among which they live; and as every one of these dogmas armed in the laws does oppress somebody there is a kind of logic in asserting that if all laws were abolished nobody would be oppressed. And it is from this logic, doubtless, that Bakounine declares "let us make away with all of them, even the supreme law—the law of God, which is the worst of all."

This Anarchy—the Anarchy of overthrowing—has a meaning at least, as opposed to what is called "Philosophical Anarchy," for to overthrow the authority which oppresses us is reasonable, if we are sure about it. But it is a different thing to afterward make Anarchy creative and put the word for the title of a school, a social school, which proposes to reconstruct society, and it has been found necessary to add another word, and call the Anarchist also Socialist.

This is quite a new birth—Anarchist Socialist, and the strangest hybrid ever brought forth—father Anarchist, mother Socialist; and such a monster that the mother Socialist kicks at it and won't let it suckle. Nevertheless this new being having come into life, it is proper to examine him—the new strain of blood or doctrine that he is to introduce into the social structure; and this new doctrine appears to be the valuation of the individual.

Anarchy, starting from the feeling that the individual was oppressed by authorities, which urged him to revolt against all of them, naturally the formative conception of society which follows the revolt considers that the establishing of freedom for the individual should be the chief concern of society, as opposed to the old idea that its chief concern should be maintaining an ideal welfare to which the inclination of the individual was to be sacrificed. Anarchist Socialism would take this new conception to be just, and in combined human relations would move under the leading that the welfare of the whole—the general welfare—was to be found in keeping alive the feeling that happiness after all, and only, was the happiness of each part, which the part must recognize for itself, and which must be allowed to it.

And so Anarchy, senseless as the unqualified name of a societary philosophy may have given us a progressed idea, and hybridized so strangely with Socialism, and tempering it, would stand for protected liberty in the era of associated operations for the supply of human wants into which we are now unavoidably entering, and which having at once more ambition and power of control than any status of society before it but for the fastening to it of the anarchistic idea would give the individual no consideration at all and utterly abolish liberty.

J. W. G.

Here we have another who will persist in getting astray on the meaning of the term Anarchy. Persons who use any term should find out if possible whether it has more than one meaning and whether people in general understand it aright. There seem to be so many who have a conception of Anarchy all their own, and insist that theirs is the only one worth considering. In such cases it is well first to consult a good dictionary and then accept the meaning given. But to this word there are so many meanings as almost to bewilder one and generally he picks out that one most nearly coinciding with his or her prejudices. Now when it happens that a word has so many meanings the only way left is to get at the original root meaning. Let us analyze the term Anarchy. An is the Greek prefix and means without, or the absence of. Arch is a shortened form of a Greek word which means government or force used to control another. Y is the shortened form of a suffix which means the state of or the condition of. Taking these terms together as a word we have the meaning of Anarchy to be: The absence of force used to control the action of another. This much is plain that before any subject can be discussed intelligently we must agree on the meaning of the terms used.

Now, Socialism in the same way has nothing in its meaning which implies force. It is simply a compact to work

together and divide the products according to the labor expended. But the governmental upholders of force would make all work on the socialistic plan whether they wished to or not. Now, it is clear that it is not the idea of Socialism, but the idea of compelling one to be a Socialist which is opposed to Anarchy. In the right sense I may be either a Socialist, a Communist or the rankest kind of an individualist and still be an Anarchist. The term Anarchy carries with it no plan for the solution of the industrial problem but simply implies the absence of any compelling force of man by man.

G. H. A.

"THE STRONGEST INCENTIVE."

Those who predict an increase of crime under Anarchy do not consider nor appreciate the importance of conventionalism in its control of society. Ninety-nine things in a hundred that we do are done without a thought as to whether it be right or wrong, lawful or unlawful, and the few things we do because the law requires it are oftener wrong than right. The masses of society think, speak and act conventionally, just as everyone else thinks, speaks and acts. They are so fond of the approbation, of their superiors especially, that the saying originated "as well be out of the world as out of the fashion." The love of approbation is the strongest incentive to action of any prompting motive in man's mind. It prompts him to volunteer to murder, in war, men against whom he has no personal grievance. He will face the perils of a campaign in the Philippines and the cannon's mouth all for glory. He will brave the perils of a voyage among icebergs in search of the north pole all for honor. He will wallow in the dirty pool of politics by resorting to duplicity, perjury, promises and profanation to get an office of honor. What is honor but the approbation and adoration of men? Men acquire more riches after they have a competence, for the masses look up to and approve riches. In free society, where all are equal, the energy expended in acquiring riches would be expended in promoting the evolution of good thoughts and refinement of character. There is no one so depraved as to have no spark of sympathy and good in him that may be appealed to and enkindled into a flame. A kind-hearted, sympathetic lady visited a prison where was confined the most hardened criminal ever in its walls. She was warned not to approach him—that he might insult her. She approached him, however, at her peril, and presented him with a bouquet accompanied with kind words. He broke down with emotion, and, as the tears coursed down his cheeks, in a faltering, tremulous voice, he said: "Good woman, I did not know that anyone in the world cared for me." If one feels that he has no one to love him, nor be loved by him, he is driven to a despair that must end in suicide, insanity or crime. The necessity and importance of kind notice of our neighbors, and the weak in particular, would be more recognized in a free society where precept and example were depended on instead of coercion. As our faith in force is strong our faith in example and precept is weak.

After all, government has little to do with our actions except to invade and suppress our privileges to do our best.

As we descend in the scale of animal existence we find the imitative faculty more manifest. A monkey will do all in its power to please its superior, man, by imitating him. So will the lower races of men imitate and please the superior. During slavery, where the master was attached to his slaves, the slave, knowing his master loved him, did all he could to please his master, by imitating him. Now, since the close relationship has been broken, the power of example has not been so effective for good. In order to draw out the imitativeness and approbateness of the inferior there must be an appreciative reciprocal relation, and that which formerly existed, similar to the family relations, between the negro and white races has been broken. The two races now stand alienated as enemies as a rule. In the south while they have great faith in force, they have little in law—in general government. Could it be worse in a free society of Anarchy? Would not the condition be better if the power to monopolize natural opportunities was removed? The slaves of the south were not freed. They are in worse slavery than ever, since the old masters own the land by law.

If the lower animals are controlled by kindness, and delight in imitating to gain the approbation of their superiors, may not inferior men be so influenced by their superiors? Would education, moral example, love of order, of the beautiful, and peace and plenty that would exist in free society have no moral effect? Conventionalism alone, which serves a good purpose among the less thoughtful, would be a safeguard in the absence of coercion. The worst boys I know are as fashionable in their dress as their means will allow.

The doctrine of total depravity, a doctrine that destroys all faith in humanity, is a bane to moral progress. The reverse is true. Man is as good as his environments will permit—restrained as he is from exercising his natural faculties to their gratification. No natural desire would be abnormal and out of reason in a condition of freedom. Society, by reason of government, has made crimes of actions that are not crimes. Society is, in many respects, unnatural, by reason of restraint of freedom. Many natural acts are made wrong by conventional custom. While conventionalism, as a rule, is a blessing, it may serve a bad end as society is now constituted.

J. C. BARNES.

Hindsboro, Ill.

STRAIGHTENING THINGS OUT.

In No. 61 of DISCONTENT Brother Verity inquires, "Is Communism absurd?" and by the construction of the first sentence which follows leaves the readers to infer that I had made the statement that it "was absurd for people to adopt the communistic state as a means of increasing their happiness." I protest that statement. It is unfair. However, I cannot place the blame for this misunderstanding upon Bro. Verity. In a recent article I stated, carelessly, that "wealth must be measured and kept separate." This was an unfortunate blunder. It would indeed be wonderful if I could write the amount of matter I have the past two years without making any mistakes. And to this blunder I attribute, at least in part, the reason

for all the queries Mr. Verity hurls at me in No. 61.

Now let me make myself understood. Suppose I should demand the freedom of every man, woman and child to get drunk whenever they pleased. Would you charge me with advocating drunkenness? The freedom to do a thing doesn't necessarily imply the doing. And when I demand the right of every laboring man to issue money, or devise any plan he may see fit to overcome the difficulties of barter, that doesn't necessarily imply that he WILL or MUST do so in all cases. But I nevertheless insist that each individual must have this liberty and opportunity, else he is not a free man. Now is Communism going to give him that opportunity? Evidently not; for, according to many of its advocates, money, weights, measures, yard sticks, etc., are going to be done away with; no form of wealth can be claimed by the individual, to the use of which he can exclude others. The hat on my head belongs as much to the group as to me, and any of the coproprietors can lay claim to the use of it at their discretion. If Communism doesn't mean this, what does it mean? This idea is what I characterize as absurd, for in such a society I am no more of an individual than a drop of water thrown into the ocean. Liberty means security, exclusiveness, complete individuality; and I'm not a complete individuality unless I have exclusive control over the products of my labor. And when I say MY labor I mean all that wealth that other men voluntarily SURRENDER into my possession in payment for my services. Though I cannot produce or manufacture the simplest article by my unaided efforts as an individual, nevertheless I can render services which other men are as anxious to secure as I am to secure their services. They prove this by their willingness to trade with me. And what is trade? It is a MUTUAL SURRENDER of products or services. And when I render a service to other men (society) and they SURRENDER into my possession certain forms of wealth in payment, that wealth is literally the product of MY labor, and as absolutely mine as if no other human hand had ever touched it but mine. To deny this is to deny the right of free contract; to affirm is to prove conclusively that liberty leads, as Proudhon says, to individual possession, and not common ownership. Is that not so, Bro. Verity?

But, perhaps, when Bro. Verity uses the word "Communism" he means something different from what I have been led to understand. I believe in, and am an enthusiastic advocate of, voluntary cooperation, not only in production, but also in consumption, when agreeable. For instance, where 20 or 50 families, or a large number of individuals, of compatibility of intellect, temperament, etc., desire to economize by having their cooking, etc., done in one kitchen instead of 20, it would be an act of wisdom, in my opinion, to so arrange their affairs. If that is what Mr. Verity means by liberty leading to Communism, then, instead of disputing that claim, I heartily second it. But voluntary cooperation doesn't mean common ownership. The outcome of liberty inevitably means equality of fortune. But common ownership of wealth, as Proudhon so elaborately demonstrates, results in the most outrageous forms of inequality and in-

justice. In common ownership some are always more fortunate than others. And men will fight and murder each other over common property more readily than over what is called "private property." Now, as it can be demonstrated most conclusively that common ownership of wealth results in inequality and injustice, I insist that it is absurd to imagine that liberty leads to Communism—that is, common ownership.

Before replying directly to Mr. Verity's questions, let me, as briefly as possible, show how equality of fortunes is absolutely inevitable under equal freedom, and poverty inexcusable. Men are not now, never were, nor never will be, equal in capacities—intellect, skill, strength, etc. But that fact has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the causes of poverty. There are in human society almost as many "functions" as individuals. Herbert Spencer, for instance, fulfills one function by writing "First Principles" and other philosophic essays. The semi-nude savage, whose brain development is but a few degrees above the orang, gathers coconuts and ivory. Is not the gathering of coconuts and ivory as important and useful as teaching philosophy? If so, why should not the individuals in each "function" be equally remunerated? Again, the function of blacking shoes is just as "honorable" and useful as painting pictures. Why, then, does not the boot-black receive as much pay as the artist, or any other member of society, for that matter? We have discovered, then, that functions and services being equal, we do not have to appeal to religion or sentiment, but that equality of fortunes has its basis in absolute justice. Our next step is to find why it is that this economic principle or natural law (so called) is not in FULL operation. This is easily done. Society pays Rockefeller, for instance, more wages than it pays me because he can prevent people from going into the business (function) that he is engaged in, but I can't. Free competition would bring fortunes to a common level. If any trade, profession, or "function," offered greater inducements than others, every man, prompted by selfishness, would rush into that trade or business, with the inevitable result—equality of fortunes. **THIS IS THE WORLD SAVED BY SELFISHNESS!**

Equal opportunities, and not common ownership, is what will bring about equal fortunes and make poverty an impossibility.

Bro. Verity bids me remember that Anarchist Communism is founded upon agreement—freedom of contract. Very good; I'm with him on that platform. And taking that platform as our common basis I will answer a few of his questions. Having already explained that every individual must have an equal opportunity with all others to enter any trade, profession, or business, in which he thinks he can employ his talents to the greatest advantage, it is to be presumed that the 10 fishermen are ALL experts in that function—their strength and skill approximating equality—else they would not be permanently employed in that calling. This being so, the question of an equitable division of the social wealth obtained in exchange for the fish would be a simple one, and would be amicably settled upon, most likely, prior to the catching. The weighing and measuring is as much a part of

the production as the catching. Mr. Verity unwittingly admits this when he says: "Isn't the individual who figures out each one's share worthy of his hire, and does he not receive for his services a portion of his fellow man's products without returning an equivalent, which is robbery?" If he does not return "an equivalent," how can he be "worthy of his hire"? and if "worthy of his hire," how can he be a robber? Robbers do not perform their labors at the solicitation of their victims. This absurd question betrays on Mr. Verity's part a strong prejudice against weighing and measuring, buying and selling, etc. This being so, let me ask you, Mr. Verity, to beware of your prejudices; they are sure to lead you into all kinds of absurdities.

Mr. Verity doesn't see any use for money under right conditions. "Any instrument, devised by laborers, to overcome the difficulties of a direct system of barter," is money. Under a right system laborers will have no difficulties to overcome in bartering! Is that what you mean, Bro. Verity? Suppose a barber desired to hear Paderewsky play the piano; and suppose the latter didn't care to have his hair cut, how are they to barter their "products"? They've got to have something to overcome the difficulty, haven't they? And that something is money. The communistic prejudices against money are just as absurd as the country parson's prejudices against the city theatres. Again I say "beware of your prejudices." For by teaching that kind of doctrine you are playing into the hands of the money monopolists and usurers. The working people must learn the lesson that THEY ALONE can issue money; for until they master the "difficulties of barter" they will always be slaves.

When I said the Anarchists are advising the working people not to concentrate wealth, I meant (and distinctly stated) not to surrender their individual ownership, for as surely as they did, it would pass from the many into the hands of the few. Yet Mr. Verity says he is in favor of "concentration," using the word in a different sense, leaving the reader to suppose I was not in favor of large cooperative industries! Ten thousand men can cooperate in one industry without a single individual SURRENDERING anything. Wealth cannot possibly concentrate—get into the hands of the few—in the absence of usury.

Form all the co-operative enterprises you desire, yet I will still continue to warn all that the idea that common ownership in all things will bring about equality is a delusion and a snare.

W. A. SMITH.

MARRIAGE.

Marriage is the only institution in society, the only custom in individual life, in which, where a mistake is made, it cannot be rectified. It compels men and women to live a mistake all their lives, and makes them continuously unhappy. People should be as free to correct the mistakes of marriage as in any other thing. The denial of this right is an infringement upon one of the self-evident truths of the declaration of independence—the right to the pursuit of happiness. Why are there "some" happy marriages? Simply because the right persons are associated, because no mistake is made! But what has marriage law to do with these, that it should

be credited with the good result? Absolutely nothing! Were there no law upon the subject these unions would be made and maintained all the same. No law is required to hold them inseparable. It is only the unhappily married whom the law affects, and them it affects not only to their own detriment, but most injuriously in the person of their children, who suffer from the mistake made by the parents. Here is the fountain head of a large portion of the vice and crime by which the world is cursed. Hence, so-called legal marriage is a "dangerous" institution and ought to be abolished.

Suppose marriages under statute law were to be abolished, what would be the effect? Why, just this: It would leave all existing marriages just where they are. They would not be sundered. So much for the charges of Anarchy brought against "repealers". Nor would it prevent any from still marrying for life if any should want to do so. But this is what it would do that is so much needed to remedy the evils of so "many unhappy marriages": It would allow people to marry for any term of years they might agree upon, or to marry and allow the term to be determined by the continuance of the basis upon which it is founded. Love ought to constitute the basis of marriage. If so, then it ought to be the sole determining power in all questions of duration, since when the basis of a union is no longer present the unity is gone, and, if a continuance is enforced by law, it is a sham and a mockery, unworthy of this enlightened age, and pregnant with misery and discord. If the children argument be advanced against "repeal," then I would reply: that this is the weakest of all supports. The best conditions between the sexes are demanded to produce the best children. The best children, and the happiness of parents, ought to be the social aim, let their production depend on what it may. The form observed counts for nothing. It is the result attained that is important. Now, no sane person will contend that the best children come from "unhappy marriages"; but it is unquestionable that, other things being equal, the best children result from happy unions, whether marriages or not. Hence, it is self-evident that legal marriage is not only bad and wrong, but also dangerous. It is a gross violation of individual rights; an unwarrantable interference with individual conscience; a curse to both individuals and society; the most insidious of all the slaveries.—J. H. Blood, in *The Investigator*, 1880.

Why burn a book or imprison its author on the theory that it tends to the commission of crime? Books fight their own battles. Nobody desires to burn a book, or exclude it from the mails, or forbid the reading of it, unless he is conscious that he cannot refute it or show it to be bad or false.—Elizur Wright.

Love is useless except it be expressed. We are all trying to express it. Intelligence or the degree of intelligence which we have gained governs our choice of means by which to express love.—The Nautilus.

The better part of every man's education is that which he gives himself.—James Russell Lowell.

OF LOVE.

There are enlightened men and women by whom love has ceased to be regarded as a bargain between two, and is looked on to be as abounding as friendship, and as reasonable, and to be enjoyed as freely. It is true there are conditions of responsibility, related to and following love and its enjoyment or culmination, but these are practical matters to be settled as other practical matters are. With the development of love as a refined emotion between free men and women comes also the development of intelligence and a broader sense of duty and of respect for each other. In the old state men and women have provided for each other as husbands and wives; in the new, free men and women will still provide for each other, but in forms in which the independence of the woman will be recognized and maintained.

J. W. G.

"TO SHOW MY 'TORITY."

Many years ago, when the broadbrim hat was still too ordinary a sight to attract attention to the wearer, a kindly Quaker was walking along a street in Philadelphia when he spied a diminutive colored urchin leading a forlorn dog which he was continually striking with a stick.

"Little boy," said the Quaker severely, "does thee not know it is very wicked to hurt a dumb animal? Why does thee hit the dog?"

Promptly the urchin replied: "He's my dog, an I hits him just to show my 'tority."

How like that little darkey are the ministers and editors and patriots who wish the United States to whip the Filipinos for the sake of "our national honor"; to show our "authority" over our Filipinos purchased at the rate of two dollars a head!—Wilmington Justice.

This cry of delicacy, this dictating to woman what is proper for her to talk about, and threatening her with the loss of "social status," if and if, is very disagreeable, but it does not frighten me in the least. The wrongs which woman has suffered, and is still suffering, because of ignorance on this subject of the relations of the sexes is not longer to be tolerated. Is the relation of parent and child an obscene relation? Do husbands and wives commit acts that bring the blush of shame to their brows when discussed in regard to the physiological effects? If such is the case, what shall we do? If the laws of nature are vulgar and obscene, surely it is not strange that the effects of the use of the law should be obscene men and women. I cannot admit that the discussion of any subject relating to the physical health, or the "law of population," is improper in even a family paper. I pity the father of grown-up daughters who could not trust them with a treatise on sexual intemperance. I trust their innocence and ignorance upon the relations of the sexes may not result in the doing of any act that shall cause that father to blush for them.—Lucy N. Colman.

Justice is not postponed. A perfect equity adjusts its balance in all parts of life. The dice of God are always loaded. The world looks like a multiplication

table, or a mathematical equation, which, turn it as you will, balances itself. Take what figure you will, its exact value, no more nor less, still returns to you. Every secret is told, every crime is punished, every virtue is rewarded, every wrong is redressed, in silence and certainty. What we call retribution is the universal necessity by which the whole appears wherever a part appears. If you see smoke there must be fire. If you see a hand or limb you know that the trunk to which it belongs is there behind.

Every act rewards itself, or, in other words, integrates itself, in a two-fold manner: first, in the thing, or in the real nature; and, secondly, in the circumstance, or in apparent nature. Men call the circumstance the retribution. The casual retribution is the thing, and is seen by the soul. The retribution in the circumstance is seen by the understanding; it is inseparable from the thing, but is often spread over a long time, and so does not become distinct for many years. The specific stripes may follow late after the offense, but they follow because they accompany it. Crime and punishment grow out of one stem. Punishment is a fruit that, unsuspected, ripens within the flower of the pleasure which concealed it. Cause and effect, means and ends, seed and fruit, cannot be severed, for the effect already blooms in the cause, the end pre-exists in the means, the fruit in the seed.—Emerson.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

"Here the holiest book of prayers? Weal and sorrow see; At its first there stands and stares God's adultery." —Nietzsche.

It is not by anti-imperialistic organization nor individual protest against the forcible crushing out of a nation's aspiration for freedom that the downfall of this criminal aggression is to come. It is the imperialists' own avalanche that will yet bury them. A builder who is careless of foundations, materials and perpendiculars will soon have his house tumbling about his ears, however exemplary a husband, neighbor or Methodist he may be.

The foundations of expansion are the shifting sands of expediency; its materials are lies, brutalities, ambitions and greed; its bulging outlines warn the observer to shun the premises; its ties are cumulative and its own weight will duly accomplish its ruin.—Extracts from address of William Lloyd Garrison.

Satisfied, are you? So were the most stupid black people on the southern plantations. They had no higher conception of human relationship than that under which they had been born and reared. Every colored fellow who was at all intelligent had dreams of wider liberties and was planning to get into Canada. He was a "runaway nigger," and his selling price was lowered because he could think a little. Whenever your mind can grasp a higher relationship than the dog-eat-dog competitive one under which we live you will want it. That you are satisfied with the present argues that you are not yet mentally capable of higher ideals. Shame on you.—Appeal to Reason.

A WRONG IMPRESSION.

By some inscrutable means the impression seems to have gotten into the minds of some people that this association is organized for the purpose of building homes and furnishing supplies for all who chose to visit or reside here. Any one capable of reading the standing notice on page 4 can readily realize that the association charges a fee for membership, also cash for lot to build upon, thereby conclusively showing that it is not an eleemosynary institution. However well disposed the membership may be they are not in a position to build houses for others; and were they able to do so they would not desire as members those who would expect others to do that which they can do by industry and frugality. Poverty need be no barrier to good fellowship here, but these people are strenuous advocates of justice and none are more willing to extend a helping hand. VISITOR.

ASSOCIATION NOTES.

J. R. Burton is adding another room to his dwelling.

An addition has been made to the Penhallow residence.

Mrs. M. Galloway and her two children visited their relatives, S. B. Huber and family, last week.

This association is simply a land-holding institution, and can take no part in the starting of an industry. All industries are inaugurated by the members interested and those willing to help them. Just now we have about 65 people here (men, women and children). Streets are not opened yet and we have no sidewalks. Those thinking of coming here must expect to work, as it is not an easy job to clear this land and get it in shape for cultivation. We are not living communistic as a body; only two families are living that way, but there is nothing in our articles of incorporation and agreement to prohibit any number of persons from living in that manner if AGREEABLE.

SYMPATHY ALL WITH THE GIRL.

Old Jealousy, editor of a newspaper published up north, growls because a young couple hugged and kissed each other at midnight in the passenger depot in his town "right before a lot of unwilling spectators" who were waiting for a train, and says they were Hobsonizing each other. He says the hugging and kissing was disgusting. Then the old pessimist threatens to give the names of the couple in print.

Oh, you old impecunious, rhombohedral, irascible, antiquated, inexorable, calumniating quill jabber! You peevish, old, villifying, diabolical, acrimonious ink-slinger! You satirical, old, pig-headed, insidious, hollow-chested, Cape Cod traducer! Confound it, couldn't you let 'em hug? Want to start a protectorate over overreaching love, do away with reciprocity, throw open the doors to the markets of the world, invite competition, and build Chinese walls around human aspirations, don't ye? Opposed to monopoly and "to the victor belongs the spoils," and advocating civil service reform because you aren't in the ring, ain't you? Oh, you old fraud, our sympathy is all with the girl.—Red Wing Republican.

RECEIPTS.

Dwight 50c, Hirschberg 25c, Astor 12c.

DISCONTENT IS HANDLED BY:

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store 935 Washington st.

Boston—C. A. Sibley, 642 Washington street.

AGENTS FOR DISCONTENT.

San Francisco—L. Nylen, 17 Congo st.
Honolulu—A. Klemencic, Alakea st.

A SPIRIT PHYSICIAN—Teaches how to avoid hereditary disease and gives instruction in ways tending to insure the happiness of the family. Price 50 cents. For sale by Lois Waisbrooker, Santa Ana, Calif.

MY CENTURY PLANT—By Lois Waisbrooker—So-called because so much in advance of the time that only thinkers will appreciate. Written under the influence of an adept of old Atlantis. Shows the law of regeneration, of materialization, the root of church power, and how to free the earth of sex disease. A remarkable book. Price \$1. For sale by Lois Waisbrooker, Santa Ana, Calif.

FREEDOM, a monthly journal of Anarchist Communism. Address, 7 Lamb's Conduit St., London, W. C., England. Price 40 cents per year, postpaid.

FREE SOCIETY, an advocate of Anarchist Communism. 50 cents a year. 43 Sheridan street, San Francisco, Calif.

THE EAGLE AND THE SERPENT proclaims the gospel of "Salvation by Selfishness." For sample copy (3c.) write A. Mueller, 108 Clark street, Chicago, Ill.

THE ALTRUIST is a monthly paper, partly in phonetic spelling, and devoted to equal rights, mutual assistance, united labor, and common property. It is issued by the Altruist Community, of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, live and work together in a permanent home for their mutual enjoyment, assistance and support, and both men and women have equal rights and decide on all its business affairs by their majority vote. It now has 3,920 acres of land in Southeast Missouri on which it offers a home and employment for life to all acceptable persons who may wish to join it. 25c a year; specimen copy free. A. Longley, editor, 2319 Olive street, St. Louis, Mo.

Articles of Incorporation and Agreement of the Mutual Home Association.

Be it remembered, that on this 17th day of January, 1898, we, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a corporation under the laws of the State of Washington.

That the name of the corporation shall be The Mutual Home Association.

The purpose of the association is to assist its members in obtaining and building homes for themselves and to aid in establishing better social and moral conditions.

The location of this corporation shall be at Home City, located on Jones Bay, Pierce County, State of Washington; and this association may establish in other places in this state branches of the same where two or more persons may wish to locate.

Any person may become a member of this association by paying into the treasury a sum equal to the cost of the land he or she may select and one dollar for a certificate and subscribing to this agreement.

The affairs of this association shall be conducted by a board of trustees, elected as may be provided by the by laws.

A certificate of membership shall entitle the legal holder to the use and occupancy of not less than one acre of land nor more than two (less all public streets) upon payment annually into the treasury of the association a sum equal to the taxes assessed against the tract of land he or she may hold.

All money received from memberships shall be used only for the purpose of purchasing land. The real estate of this association shall never be sold, mortgaged or disposed of. A unanimous vote of all members of this association shall be required to change these articles of incorporation.

No officer, or other person, shall ever be empowered to contract any debt in the name of this association.

All certificates of membership shall be for life.

Upon the death of any member a certificate of membership shall be issued covering the land described in certificate of membership of deceased.

First: To person named in will or bequest.
Second: Wife or husband.
Third: Children of deceased; if there is more than one child they must decide for themselves.

All improvements upon land covered by certificate of membership shall be personal property, and the association as such has no claim thereto.

Any member has the right of choice of any land not already chosen or set aside for a special purpose.

CERTIFICATE OF MEMBERSHIP.

This is to certify that has subscribed to the articles of incorporation and agreement and paid into the treasury of The Mutual Home Association the sum of _____ dollars, which entitles _____ to the use and occupancy for life of lot _____ block _____ as platted by the association, upon complying with the articles of agreement.